

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-11, 26, 27, 30, 31, 35, and 37-49 are pending. Claims 28 and 29 are canceled herein. Claim 49 is newly added. Claims 1, 26, and 38 are independent claims. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-11, 26-39 and 43-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Suzuki. Claims 4, 5, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki.

In view of the following arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.¹ Further, for any instances in which the Examiner took Official Notice in the Office Action, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce to the taking of Official Notice, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide an affidavit to support the Official Notice taken in the next Office Action, as required by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS

A. Independent Claims 1, 26, and 38

Claim 1, rejected as allegedly anticipated by Suzuki, recites in part “a plurality of second wireless communications devices, each of the second wireless communications devices being connected to respective ones of a plurality of measurement devices in the equipment.” Thus, claim 1 requires a plurality of wireless communications devices, and a plurality of measurement devices to which each wireless communications device is respectively attached. In contrast, Suzuki discloses at most a single measurement device and wireless communications device (a pressure gauge) in a particular equipment (an automobile). (E.g., Suzuki, Fig. 1.)

For example, Suzuki’s Figure 1 shows two vehicles, where each of the two vehicles includes a single pressure gauge. Suzuki nowhere teaches or suggests that the vehicles may include a

¹ As Applicant’s remarks with respect to the Examiner’s rejections are sufficient to overcome the present rejections, Applicant’s silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future, including to argue for the separate patentability of dependent claims not specifically addressed in this paper. Further, Applicants do not necessarily agree with or acquiesce to the Examiner’s characterizations of the scope and meaning of their claims.

plurality of pressure gauges. At most, Suzuki discloses that “plural pressure units may be simultaneously displayed.” (Suzuki, page 4, line 3.) That is, Suzuki is plainly stating that multiple pressure units respectively associated with multiple vehicles may be simultaneously displayed. However, Suzuki does not anywhere teach or suggest that multiple pressure gauges, or any plurality of measurement devices are displayed or included in “an equipment.”

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are allowable over Suzuki, and the rejection of the claims must be withdrawn.

Independent claims 26 and 38, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over Suzuki at least for the foregoing reasons. Therefore, the rejections of all pending claims must be withdrawn.

B. Dependent Claim 49

Claim 49 depends from claim 38 and further recites “sending a plurality of second communications, each of the second communications being sent from a different one of the second wireless communications devices.” As recited in claim 38, each of the wireless communications devices are “associated with one of plurality of measurement devices in the equipment.” However, as discussed above, Suzuki does not teach a plurality of the recited wireless communications in the equipment. Therefore, Suzuki cannot teach or suggest “each of the second communications being sent from a different one of the second wireless communications devices.” For at least this reason, claim 49 is separately patentable, and the rejection of claim 49 must be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

All rejections have been addressed. In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under order number Order No. 65856-0054. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: August 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Charles A. Bieneman/
Charles A. Bieneman
Registration No.: 51,472
Michael B. Stewart
Registration No.: 36,018
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 10291
Attorneys for Applicant